



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WHY CALLEST THOU ME GOOD?

By BENJ. W. BACON, D.D.,
Oswego, N. Y.

Jesus' doctrine of the righteousness of God not an improved morality—Paul, not the Jerusalem Church, was right, in preaching faith, not ethics—The history of Jesus, answer to the young ruler, exhibits the Judaizing tendencies of the Palestinian church as reactionary, not merely conservative—Jesus disclaimed the title "good" as Paul disclaimed "a righteousness of mine own, even that of the law"—He claimed the divine attributes goodness, power, knowledge (to teach with authority) in the mystic sense, as acting for God through the implanted divine Spirit—This Pauline mysticism, appearing in Mark, confirmed the teaching of the fourth gospel.

THE question of the righteousness—something more than "sinlessness"—of Jesus is the oldest of Christian theology, and perhaps the furthest even now from settlement. To Paul, who certainly did not regard it as differing in kind from that required of every Christian, it meant one thing; to James something different. To the mediæval church it meant one thing, to the Reformers, if they were consistent as Paul was, it meant another. In the most recent years a distinguished American author and critic, writing on "The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations,"¹ assures us that Jesus' doctrine of the righteousness of the kingdom of God, as distinguished from that of the scribes and Pharisees, made it simply "a righteousness of the heart" as against "a righteousness of the law" (p. 63), and that the saying (Matt. 5 : 20), was "directed against the hollow externality and legalism which then prevailed, and probably implied that the true righteousness of the kingdom consists in an inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended" (p. 65). Paul's doctrine of "the righteousness which is from God upon faith," opposed to "the righteousness which is our own, even that which is by the works of the law" (Phil. 3 : 8 ff.) was, according to President Cone, a "transformation" of the teaching of Jesus.

¹ By President O. Cone. New York : Putnam's, 1893.

To this we oppose the positive conviction that the righteousness of Jesus, both as regards his own personality and that which he required of those who would be of his kingdom, was essentially different from that of the scribes and Pharisees, and essentially identical with that which Paul sets forth in his great epistles. This conviction will not be defended by appeal to the fourth gospel, in which the teaching of Jesus is admittedly recast in the moulds of a theology built upon the system of Paul, but upon the words of Jesus as reported in the oldest of our gospels, after demonstration of their primitive character in comparison with the modification they have undergone in a later gospel at the hands of a school opposed to Paul.

The light to be gained from this enquiry should fall in two directions. It should give us, first, a new and priceless insight into the vital problem of Jesus' own Messianic self-consciousness, explaining how he could at once accept such tributes to his moral perfection as would explain the characterization of Paul: "Who knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," and at the same time could reject the title "Good Master," on the ground that "There is none good but One, that is God," refusing thus to be exalted even in his highest Messianic attribute of moral perfection above the level of absolute humanity, and resting his claim of divinity where the fourth gospel rests it, in what on its human side is simply voluntary merging of our personality with the divine, and on the divine side is the mysterious but undeniable fact of the divine immanence.

Secondly, we may learn more clearly than hitherto what was the really distinctive feature that made the gospel of Jesus a new revelation comparable to the creative light shining out of darkness, not only to Paul (Rom. 7: 24 f.; 2 Cor. 4: 6; *cf.* Tit. 3: 4-7 a "faithful saying"), but to all the church, except a reactionary minority. The distinction which President Cone seeks to draw between "a righteousness of the heart," as that of Jesus and of the Sermon on the Mount, over against a righteousness of the law; an "inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended," over against a "hollow externality and legalism," is unjust both to Jesus and to his predecessors. The prophets cer-

tainly were not blind to this distinction, nor can we see in it any adequate ground for that great chasm by which Jesus separated his gospel from the preaching of John the Baptist, as if the latter belonged still to the age of "the law and the prophets," though greatest of them all; while he that was least in the new kingdom was greater than he. If the new gospel simply presented a more "inward, upright relation to the law spiritually apprehended," it can scarcely be distinguished at all from the teaching of John, as given in Luke 3:7-14. Moreover, the shades of difference between the ethical standard of John, as here given—historically, as we have every reason to think—and that found, both in the best contemporary literature, as, *e. g.*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and in the prophetic, are almost indistinguishable. Again, if we look forward from this ethical standpoint toward that of the Sermon on the Mount, comparing by the way some of the golden teachings of Hillel, some of the New Testament examples of men that "waited for the kingdom of God," scribes who declared the law of love to be "much more than all whole burnt-offering and sacrifice," and Talmudic teachings which repudiate as hypocrisy the forms of pharisaism denounced in the gospels, and declare the only true Pharisee to be he who serves God neither through fear of punishment nor hope of reward, but "from love of his Father in Heaven," we shall find it less easy than is commonly imagined to draw broad lines of demarkation between Jesus as a teacher of pure morality and some of his predecessors and contemporaries.

The more we learn of the ethical teaching of the age, the more difficult does it become to define any essential difference in requirement between the righteousness of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus, and the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees which he denounced. The task of belittling and detracting from the real beauty and greatness of other and older ethical systems and ideals for the sake of magnifying to the utmost the acknowledged superiority of the ethics of Christ is one for which we have no liking, nor is it apparent why we need feel reluctance to concede, if necessary, that in the sphere of ethics, which is simply the science of human conduct, other and

earlier teachers might have enunciated principles and rules as perfect as those of Jesus. The radical distinction which made him the conscious bearer of epoch-making glad tidings lies elsewhere.

What is unmistakably apparent from the entire gospel story is this: That Jesus was the conscious possessor of a revelation destined to mark a new era in the world's history, and that the essence of this revelation was the knowledge of the "righteousness of God," as consisting of the free gift of his spirit. As opposed to the ethical morality of the "scribes and Pharisees" that of Jesus was religious and mystical, resting ultimately upon the fundamental mystery of religion, the relation of the human to the divine personality.

If we are restricted for our conception of his doctrine to the view adopted in the Jerusalem church, and by James the Lord's brother, we must assume that this tremendous, epoch-making idea was simply such a shade of advance upon the ethical standard then in vogue as is marked, *e. g.*, in the change of the Golden Rule from the negative form of Hillel to the affirmative, and must then go on searching with ever dwindling success for something to differentiate the Christian moral standard from the best that preceded. The fact that one evangelist (Luke 10:27) places this same synopsis of the "whole duty of man" in the mouth of "a certain lawyer," while another (Mark 12:29-31) attributes it to Jesus, goes to show that the gospel writers were not greatly concerned as to who had the credit of enunciating the most perfect rule of life.

If, on the other hand, we are permitted to think that Paul's conception of his Master's teaching was in closer harmony with Jesus' real thought than that of the Judaizers, we shall understand at once how the "righteousness of God" preached by Jesus was a fundamentally different thing from the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," an epoch-making revelation in the religious history of the world, even though its definition of right conduct, its ethical standard, a purely scientific question, might not differ at all from that preached by contemporary or earlier reformers. To Paul also the righteousness of God made known

in the gospel lies not in the sphere of ethics, but of religion. It is not essentially a better *system of conduct*, but the divinely-given *means of attaining* a moral ideal already given, the objection to which was not its imperfection, although it had not till now received its highest expression, but its impracticability. The gospel was the proof of the possibility "with God" of that which "with men is impossible."

According to Paul the attempt to live up to the moral standard of the law is foredoomed to failure on account of the inherent weakness of the flesh. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God which has shined in our hearts in the face of Jesus Christ, as when the light of the creative day shone out of the darkness of chaos, is the revelation of a "spirit of adoption" given by God upon the prayer of faith, which wars against the law of sin in our members, until, overcoming it at length, we find ourselves the children of God, heirs of his nature and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ. This new spirit or disposition is a "gift of righteousness," graciously bestowed by God. He who has received it finds that the impulse of the carnal nature is now overruled by the stronger impulse of the implanted divine nature of love, so that "there is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, since they walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. The "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" makes them "free from the law of sin and of death," so that the very requirement of the law, which through the weakness of the flesh was formerly found unattainable, is now "fulfilled in them."

If the objection be raised that this doctrine of salvation by pure grace takes away from man his moral responsibility, in that it first makes his unrighteousness inevitable, and afterwards, upon his regeneration, substitutes for his own action the action of a spirit that is not his own, but implanted from above, Paul answers to the first by a doctrine (of Rabbinic origin) of federal headship in Adam, our common condemnation being a just penalty for the sin in which all participated, not merely in the loins of their fathers, but also individually, by conscious rebellion against the still present "law of the mind." But this federal

headship in the fleshly Adam is more than counterbalanced by that in the preëxistent spiritual Adam, *i. e.*, Christ. To the second he replies, that the coöperation of the divine will and the human is of necessity an inscrutable mystery, since God is absolute, and at the same time man is consciously a free agent. Therefore sanctification is a joint process, we must "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, *because* it is God that worketh in us even to *will*, as well as to do of his good pleasure." In the benediction by which a disciple of Paul entreats this grace of the spirit upon his hearers, the God of peace is besought to "make them perfect in every good work, *working in them* that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ."

While the doctrines of federal headship in the first and second Adam are of course derived from the Rabbinic schools, rather than Christian teaching, it is obvious that the Pauline conception of the gospel makes it preëminently religious, rather than ethical. This was the vital, essentially Christian element in Paul's teaching, of more than temporary validity. The moral standard in his gospel is simplified and elevated, but it is not essentially different as a rule of conduct from that of the law and the prophets. The creative new light is the revelation of a gift of God by which the unattainable is now made easy. It is still "the righteousness of the law" which is the ideal aimed at, only now it is "fulfilled in us," who "walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." God gives his own divine nature of love, his spirit of holiness, goodness, purity, unselfishness, truth, to become an indistinguishable part of our human nature. This new nature becomes then the source, the root, the spring, from which will naturally come forth in ever-growing measure the required moral perfection. This is certainly what to Paul makes Jesus the "second Adam" in whom ruined humanity achieve the ideal of the Creator. Rightly or wrongly Paul regarded this gift of grace as *the* revelation of Jesus *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and his preaching a purer, more heartfelt, more spiritual moral standard was to Paul a matter of at least very subordinate importance.

Granting now that Paul in his doctrine of justification by faith alone stood strongly opposed to the mass of the Jerusalem

church, which we must admit found in the teaching of the Master little more than this improved moral standard—admitting that if Paul was the truer of the two to the actual teaching of Jesus, he has given a more forensic *color* to the doctrine of “the righteousness of God,” in adapting it to the needs of his polemic against the Judaizers, we are concerned to show that in spite of this inevitable result of the theological struggle the more historically accurate of the two representations is Paul’s, which makes the teaching of Jesus primarily *religious*; rather than that of the reactionary Jerusalem church, which made it primarily *ethical*. No better evidence can be asked in support of this thesis than the incident related in all three of the synoptic gospels, of the young ruler who came running to Jesus saying: “Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?” It is natural that President Cone, who repudiates the idea that Jesus could have taught anything like the religious mysticism of the fourth gospel, and regards him from the Nicodemus standpoint as merely the teacher of an improved morality, should say as to this incident, that he knows of no satisfactory explanation.

As to the origin and mutual relation of the synoptic gospels we are substantially agreed with President Cone. In the nature of the case the material of which they are composed was first transmitted through the un-Pauline medium of the Jerusalem Church. In this instance the proof is abundant that the earliest form of the story is that of Mark, upon which both Luke and “Matthew”¹ are based, the former departing but very slightly from his copy, the latter independent of Luke, and introducing certain changes which radically transform the meaning, and are highly significant of the medium out of which this Judaized form of the primitive tradition has come down to us. In Mark we have undeniably the Petrine tradition, which, if it departed in either direction from strict accuracy, would incline rather toward James of Jerusalem than toward Paul.

Luke’s version, which is admittedly taken from Mark and almost verbatim, we may leave out of account. It shows no

¹ Our gospel is an enlarged and rewritten Greek version of the little compilation of *λογια* by the apostle.

tendency whatever. In Matthew we find the following striking differences, which it is easy to prove are not the variations of an independent version, but at least in part, are intentional alterations due to doctrinal presuppositions, and prove the progressive reaction of the Jerusalem Church toward pharisaism and away from the "Pauline" mysticism—if the anachronism may be permitted—of Jesus.

Beginning with the preceding context, Mark 10: 13-16, the story of the blessing of the babes, and noting that the order of events in both gospels is the same, we find, as a first difference, that Matthew (19: 13-15) substitutes "lay his hands on them and pray," for Mark's "touch them." The reverse process is improbable. Next the statement of Mark 10: 14 that Jesus "was angry" (*ἡγανάκτησε*, from the verb whose physical sense according to Liddell and Scott is "to be violently irritated") is omitted, as in Luke. The reverse process is here insupposable; the motive too is sufficiently apparent even without the corroborative evidence of Mark 3: 5 which is similarly treated by the later evangelists. The next difference is Matthew's habitual change of "kingdom of God" to "kingdom of heaven" out of reverence to the divine name; another intentional change certainly on Matthew's side. The only other difference of note in Matthew's version of this incident is the absence of Mark 10: 15, already given by him in 18: 3, and the omission of "he took them in his arms and blessed them" from Mark 10: 16, whereby, as in vs. 13, Jesus' attitude is made more reserved and dignified.

Passing to the story of the rich young man, we meet at the outset the most striking of all the differences. Instead of Mark's "Good Master, what shall I do that I may have eternal life?" followed by Jesus' protest: "Why callest thou me 'good'?" None is 'good' save one, even God," Matthew has: "Master, what *good thing*," etc., followed by the reply: "Why *askest* thou me *concerning that which is good*?" But this is followed immediately, as in Mark, by "One there is who is good," a clause which has no pertinence in the absence of the epithet "good" *applied to Jesus*, and which thus proves that the change removing Jesus' seeming disclaimer of "goodness," so incomprehensible

to this evangelist, was on Matthew's side. That the motive here was the avoidance of a doctrinal difficulty is too apparent to require further proof. But for completeness' sake observe that the tenth "commandment" is restored in Matthew from Mark's very free rendering to the exact Old Testament form, a characteristic piece of reactionary conservatism, and that in the succeeding context Mark's "hard saying" about receiving "a hundredfold, *now in this time, houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions,* and in the world to come eternal life," is emptied of all difficulty, as well as of some of its deepest significance, by the omission of the words printed in italic.

When we remember the impossibility, from the extent of verbal identity, here and elsewhere, of maintaining the independence of Matthew and Mark, it becomes a matter of practical certainty in view of such a series as this, that the dependence is on the side of Matthew, and that the differences are largely due to intentional change based on dogmatic considerations.¹ The significance of those which affect the story of the young nobleman, some of which I have yet to speak of, will not be fully apparent till we have ascertained the sense of the incident as narrated by Mark in its primitive form, and compared this with the very different sense conveyed by Matthew's version.

There is a superficial appearance in this story as if Jesus had fully coincided with the young man's point of view. He belonged to that class of Pharisees described in the Talmud as "going from teacher to teacher asking some new precept to observe," but in the obvious sincerity of his desire to "fulfil all righteousness" he is much better exemplified in Saul of Tarsus, engaged heart and soul "in all good conscience" in the effort to

¹The argument is not affected even if the now generally admitted priority of Mark be denied. Even were the version of Matt. 19 : 13-30 not derived from Mark 10 : 13-31 directly, but through some common source employed by both evangelists, it would be manifest that the variations of Matthew are all explicable as alterations from the form shown in Mark to avoid difficulties, some being inexplicable in any other way; those of Mark, on the contrary could never have been substituted for the form shown in Matthew, and are unaccountable save on the assumption of their genuineness.

be "justified by the works of the law," "as touching the law a Pharisee; as touching zeal persecuting the Church"—wherein he "verily thought he did God's service;"—"as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." The young man whom Jesus "looked upon and loved" is engaged in precisely the same effort which Paul found so agonizingly hopeless: to "fulfil *all* righteousness," "planting a hedge about the law," observing every requirement which could be suggested, even beyond its express provisions that he might thus "inherit eternal life." Passing over the paradoxical disclaimer of the epithet "good," Jesus' reply to the request for a new requirement, whose fulfilment should give assurance of eternal life, *seems* to be exactly in line with the request. "One thing thou lackest: go, sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me."

Certainly the surface sense of this reply cannot be harmonized with Paul's conception of the gospel. If the apparent meaning here was actually the teaching of Jesus, the Judaizers were right. Jesus was then merely one more of the scribes who "sit in Moses' seat binding heavy burdens and grievous to be borne," prescribing to the devout Pharisee some additional and more perfect ethical requirement, whereby one might inherit eternal life. He was then the very ideal and crown of pharisaism. Paul's Gospel could scarcely be called even a "transformation" of this, it is so radically opposed to it. If this was the Christianity of Christ, Paul was converted to something the exact opposite of what he supposed. The very foundation of Paul's Christianity was the utter collapse of this whole pharisaic system of merit with God, in an overwhelming *reductio ad absurdum*, cf. Rom. chap. 7; Gal. 2:15-21. And this collapse of pharisaism was for Paul the revelation of Christ. His answer to the suggestion that an observance of the commandments coupled with unlimited almsgiving might entitle to eternal life we have: "And if I give all my goods to feed the poor, and give my body to be burned, but have not charity—the divine spirit of love—it is nothing!"

Is it possible, then, to assume that the surface meaning of this "new commandment" of Jesus—unlimited almsgiving—is the real one? Not even the semi-Judaistic Matthew thinks it possible to take over the teaching in so bold a form. He must at least pay to Paul the tribute of inserting the law of love among the commandments which the young Pharisee has observed from his youth; Matt. 19:9; *cf.* Mark 10:19; James 2:8. But after this is done he has no hesitation in maintaining that all that Jesus required further for "perfection" ("if thou wouldst be perfect," Matt. 19:21; *cf.* Mark), was to "give all his goods to feed the poor." This was the distinctive feature of the Jerusalem church. Its Christianity was pharisean; its exaltation of unlimited almsgiving as the crown of all virtues stamps all its literature, and its exaggerated esteem for poverty obtained for it in its later history as a heretical sect the epithet Ebionite; *cf.* Acts 4:32-37; Gal. 2:10; James 2:1-9, 14-17; 5:1-6. With these "amendments" Matthew takes over Mark's account of what Jesus required of the rich young man as a *bona fide* statement of what entitles a man to eternal life. A scrutiny of the original from which this quasi-Ebionite version of the story is derived will show, on the contrary, that the saying of Jesus was intended to work as complete a *reductio ad absurdum* in the young man's mind as was later accomplished in the mind of Paul. To this end it is necessary to return to Jesus' first utterance, so grievously distorted in Matthew, concerning his own "goodness."

Why should Jesus begin his reply to such a vital question as that of the young Pharisee with such an apparently trivial objection as his criticism of the epithet "good" applied to himself? Why *not* call him "Good Master"? The answer can only be that, in the sense the Pharisee would give the word, Jesus did not wish to be considered "good," and that the difference in their conceptions of "goodness" was of fundamental significance. To the Pharisee a man who "as touching the righteousness which is in the law" was "found blameless," and who both by precept and example had set forth the duty of absolute self-renunciation for the kingdom of God's sake, was "good," and was thus entitled by merit to "eternal life." He comes running and kneeling

to Jesus because convinced that Jesus is in this sense "good." But to Jesus the man who had done all this is nothing of the kind. He is "an unprofitable servant, who has done that which it was his duty to do." He, Jesus, in his own view, had done nothing to merit reward, nor did he even deserve to be called "good" in the pharisean sense, *i. e.*, "possessed of accumulated merit." On the contrary, whatever goodness he has is due simply to the grace of God, the indwelling divine Spirit which impels him to thus act. There is none "good" but One, that is, God. To find the exact parallel of this remarkable disclosure of "goodness" on Jesus' part there is none other to whom we can turn than just the man who is supposed to have "transformed" the teaching of Jesus on this score. Paul had been, "as touching the righteousness of the law, found blameless," but had gladly "counted all this but refuse," that he might . . . "be found in Christ, *not having a righteousness of mine own*, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by (Greek '*upon*') *faith*." It is thus, "if by any means," that Paul would "attain unto the resurrection from the dead."

Wherein now does this religious mysticism of Paul, more fully developed in the "Johannine" theology, differ from the teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, concerning the "righteousness of God?" This, while it far "exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees," and supersedes "all the law and the prophets," yet leaves not one jot or tittle unfulfilled. It is nevertheless of a totally different nature. It is to be "sought" by asking of the Father, who "delighteth to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him," and men thus become "children of the Highest, because He is good even to the unthankful and the evil." The possession of this new implanted Spirit of the Father goes beneath the very roots of the selfish nature. It "makes the tree good," and thus obtains by spontaneous action the "good fruit."

If this adoption into a divine sonship by the descent and indwelling of the divine Spirit is not the essential thing in the teaching of Jesus, differentiating it immeasurably from the best of reformed moral standards, whether in that or previous times,

what is? What entitles it to be called a "gospel?" Why should the baptism of John be distinguished from it as only "with water," whereas this is "with the Holy Ghost"?

We derive, then, from our interpretation of this pregnant story of the young nobleman, first, Jesus' definition of his own "goodness." It is not, any more than that of Paul, the righteousness which is of the law, even though, according to that, he were "found blameless;" but "that which is given by God upon faith." And here we come upon the profound significance of this story from the earliest of our gospels to the doctrine of the person of Christ, an insight into his own Messianic self-consciousness which corroborates the essential teaching of Paul and of the Johannine school as to his teaching regarding his own divinity. What Paul gives as the very kernel of "the ministry of reconciliation, how that God was in Christ," what the fourth gospel reiterates again and again as the very essence of Jesus' teaching, how that the finite humanity which he shares with us is so capable of sublimation by self-merging in the Spirit of God "that they also may be in the Father as Christ was in the Father and the Father in him"—this is the implication and presupposition of Jesus' doctrine of "the righteousness of God" as here applied to himself. It is the justification of both the Pauline and the Johannine mysticism. For Jesus' disclaimer of "goodness" in his own right, is simply the parallel to his disclaimer in this same earliest gospel of all divine attributes, all Messianic qualifications, except as by complete self-surrender, he has made himself the vehicle for the divine power, wisdom and goodness. In accepting the greatness divinely "thrust upon" him, his choice of Messianic titles was that which most completely expresses the utter dependence, weakness, helplessness of humanity over against God: "the Son of Man." The entire record of his exaltation is simply that he "humbled himself" utterly before God. He would be Messiah only "to minister," not to be ministered unto." The greater the claims he makes for God *in* him as type and representative of the race, the more complete is his own self-obliteration.

It is thus also with his claims of power. Of himself he can do nothing. When the demoniac healed is bidden to go home and tell his friends, he is to tell, not what Jesus has done, but "what the Lord (*i. e.*, God; see Luke) hath done for thee." When sufferers seek aid, they are bidden to "have faith in God," whose power cannot be limited. Conversely he is not disconcerted when, as in Nazareth, "he could do no mighty work." He never claimed that *he* had power. God had it, and if it were not forthcoming, it was due to the "unbelief" of those that sought it.

So also of his Messianic teaching with authority, and divine wisdom. He teaches that which the divine voice clearly speaks to the heart and conscience of humanity, what "the light that is in thee" reveals.

So of his "goodness." "There is none good but One, that is God." He does not pretend to be "good;" he is conscious of an indwelling Spirit of the Father, which has descended to abide upon him with the assurance: "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." To be a "son of the Highest" by living in this Spirit of the Father is all the "goodness" he knows. But if the scribe or Pharisee ask what can be done to merit eternal life by fulfilling all righteousness, he can only point to the fruits "the righteousness of God" has borne. He himself and these followers with him have left all, house and brethren, sisters and mother (is there no personal remembrance in this?) fathers, children and lands for the gospel's sake. This they have been prompted to do simply by the Spirit of the Father in them, and feel that already they are reaping a hundredfold, while for the future they have in this same Spirit a pledge of the coveted "eternal life." If, then, one who represents the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees" asks: What lack I yet? from the standpoint of comparative meritoriousness, Jesus can only point to the examples present of the fruits of the Spirit and suggest: "By this much thy righteousness has fallen short of that given by God. Thou hast not yet forsaken all and entered the way of Calvary." The hope for this young man is that when he has tried in his righteousness *without* God to equal

that thus exemplified, he will find as Paul did that it is "impossible;" and thereupon, grasping the divine gift of a new spirit, will find that "*with* God all things are possible."

Secondly, this interpretation of Jesus' definition of "goodness" makes the gospel to every man in reality "glad tidings" of grace and truth instead of a mere improved science of ethics. The religious mysticism which the above interpretation implies in the teaching of Jesus is indeed wanting from the portrait drawn in Matthew's version. In the church presided over in the year 61 by James the Lord's brother, surnamed by the Jews for his legalistic piety, "the just," *i. e.*, devout, there was a very different conception of the gospel. James himself, speaking in the year 61 A.D., describes the adherents of that church as "many myriads from among the Jews, all zealous for the law." They felt far more hostility to Paul than their neighbor Jews did to them. To them Jesus doctrinally had simply put the crown upon pharisaism, establishing its teaching of "eternal life;" extending its moral standard by a completed "hedge of the law," wherein almsgiving and the law of love were the chief new features; justifying and uplifting its Messianic hopes and its eschatological expectations. This Palestinian branch of the vine ultimately became in part reabsorbed into Judaism, as from its nature we should expect; in part it degenerated into a mere heretical sect, denying (as we might also have expected) the divinity of Christ, and laying all stress upon the ethics of socialism, and the inequalities of wealth. Not abiding in the vine it was cast forth as a branch and withered. Does this Judaistic-Ebionite element of the primitive church represent then the historic teaching of Jesus? Or is it represented rather by an element whose first great leader fell a martyr to the persecuting zeal of Pharisean zealots, because he maintained that Jesus had taught of a new, universal temple superseding that "holy place," and a new righteousness which should "change the customs Moses delivered unto us?" At least the Gospel of Paul, the second great leader of this school, so far as it came to him from human lips at all, came through Stephen and the men who had *thus* understood Jesus. It was not received from certain

"super-eminent apostles" whom as persecutor he had not thought worthy of notice, though knowing they were in Jerusalem (Gal. 1:17) even while he journeyed to Damascus in pursuit of the Hellenists.

To our apprehension the incident of Mark 10:17-22 is of no small importance to show what Jesus meant by "the righteousness of God," both in himself, and in as many as with him should become "partakers of the divine nature." In the contrast which the "amendments" of Matthew present to this version we have the evidence that the Judaizers were really, as Paul maintained, reactionaries, unconsciously, or perhaps in some cases even consciously (see Gal. 6:12) disloyal to the fundamentals of Christ's gospel; not merely that they felt unable to follow Paul into a necessary "transformation" of the earlier doctrine. When the critical relation of the two versions of this story in Mark and Matthew can be reversed, and Mark's shown to be derived from Matthew's, and not *vice versa*, it may be possible to maintain that Paul was the innovator, and "they of James" the true conservatives. Until then "the gospel of Jesus the Christ the Son of God" must be understood to have been fundamentally and essentially, that which is developed into a philosophic system, and to some extent adapted to new conditions, in the theology of Paul. This reversal, it is safe to say, will not be obtained until every canon now known to the "higher criticism" for determining which of two interdependent accounts is the older, has been proved to be false or futile.

After Paul the leadership in the Hellenistic school of Christianity passed to Ephesus and the great theologians who have given us the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine literature with its doctrine of the Λόγος. It was not long ere this view had established itself everywhere as the only orthodox Christianity in a supremacy that today is stronger than ever.

We need hardly add that the great current of the Johannine gospel tradition, which toward the close of the century comes to take up and carry along with it the Pauline doctrine, however small we make the actual written contributions of the apostle John thereto, is nevertheless a witness of inestimable value to

the fact that this mystical and religious interpretation of the doctrines of "the righteousness of God," divine sonship and the Messiahship was at least a vital part of the historic teaching of Jesus.